



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,290	01/11/2002	Jagadish Bandhole	020706-000910US	6856
33031	7590	10/19/2005		
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP 4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD. BLDG. 4, SUITE 201 AUSTIN, TX 78759			EXAMINER FOWLKES, ANDRE R	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/044,290

Applicant(s)

BANDHOLE ET AL.

Examiner

Andre R. Fowlkes

Art Unit

2192

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 02 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants arguments have been considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

- 1) The Final Office action applies the art in a manner that results in terms within the text having multiple meanings, at p. 8:15-17, 9:24-25 and 11:12-25.

Examiner's response:

- 1) The Applicant is requesting clarification as to the features of White that the examiner is citing against the limitations "first and second subnet", the "dynamic computing environment (DCE)" and "processing multiple tasks simultaneously". Clarification is provided below:

- White discloses a first subnet, wherein storage and computing devices are allocated to form the subnet at fig. 7, items 130, 132, 134, 136 and 138.

- White discloses a second subnet at fig. 7, items 142, 144, 146 and 148.

- White discloses the DCE as the combination of the two allocated subnets of figure 7, discussed above and at White col. 15:7-40, "To illustrate this aspect cooperative processing between heterogeneous systems, return to FIG. 7. Two interconnected systems are depicted as an example only as more systems can frequently be involved in any transaction. Input invoking a transaction is received at logical terminal 130 and forwarded to the DAA environment 132. Logical terminal 130 could be an IBM 3270 device, an intelligent workstation window, a local terminal or a non-DAA process. The DAA environment 132 is a homogeneous application processing environment (e.g., a transaction processing system). DAA environment 132 invokes the required transaction. An application may require a transaction 134 that only requires information from local database 136. Or, a transaction 138 may require information from both local database 136 and distributed database 140. At the same time, terminal 150 may address DAA environment 148 to invoke transaction 144 which requires information from local database 142 and distributed database 140. It is possible with the present invention that transaction 144 (or 134, 138, 146) could use local database 142, call another transaction (say 134, 138 or 146) to request information from local database 136, and return the information to the DAA environment 148 to be properly formatted and return to terminal 150. Looking now at FIG. 8, a more clear example of this cooperative processing across heterogeneous platforms is shown. Assume a data input stream 92 is received from a UNIX computer 86. This data stream 92 invokes application 94 to process procedure 96. Procedure 96 obtains information from DBMS 100 via SQL requests 98. As procedure 96 is processing, information is needed from DBMS which in turn needs information from DBMS 124 to complete its processing. With the present invention, this information may now be obtained, while remaining transparent to the user on the UNIX86".

- White discloses processing multiple tasks simultaneously at col. 15:24-29, "It is possible with the present invention that transaction 144 (or 134, 138, 146) could use local database 142, call another transaction (say 134, 138 or 146) to request information from local database".

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

- 2) White does not disclose subnets or linking a subnet to a computer resource, as claimed in claim 1, at p. 10:1-16.

Examiner's response:

- 2) The examiner disagrees with applicant's characterization of the applied art. White discloses the linking a subnet to a computer resource at figure 7, subnet 1, composed of items 130, 132, 134, 136 and 138, wherein the subnet is linked to computing resources such as the distributed database, item 140.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

- 3) White does not disclose the "allocating" limitations of claim 1, at p. 10:17-22.

Examiner's response:

- 3) The examiner disagrees with applicant's characterization of the applied art. White does disclose the "allocating" limitations of claim 1, at col. 15:22-24, "terminal 150 may address DAA environment 148 to invoke (i.e. allocate a local or distributed database) transaction 144 which requires information from local database 142 and distributed database".

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

- 4) White does not disclose a dynamic computing environment, as disclosed in the present invention, at p. 11:8-10.

Examiner's response:

- 4) The examiner disagrees with applicant's characterization of the applied art. White discloses the DCE as the combination of the two allocated subnets of figure 7, discussed above and at White col. 15:7-40, "To illustrate this aspect cooperative processing between heterogeneous systems, return to FIG. 7. Two interconnected systems are depicted as an example only as more systems can frequently be involved in any transaction. Input invoking a transaction is received at logical terminal 130 and forwarded to the DAA environment 132. Logical terminal 130 could be an IBM 3270 device, an intelligent workstation window, a local terminal or a non-DAA process. The DAA environment 132 is a homogeneous application processing environment (e.g., a transaction processing system). DAA environment 132 invokes the required transaction. An application may require a transaction 134 that only requires information from local database 136. Or, a transaction 138 may require information from both local database 136 and distributed database 140. At the same time, terminal 150

may address DAA environment 148 to invoke transaction 144 which requires information from local database 142 and distributed database 140. It is possible with the present invention that transaction 144 (or 134, 138, 146) could use local database 142, call another transaction (say 134, 138 or 146) to request information from local database 136, and return the information to the DAA environment 148 to be properly formatted and return to terminal 150. Looking now at FIG. 8, a more clear example of this cooperative processing across heterogeneous platforms is shown. Assume a data input stream 92 is received from a UNIX computer 86. This data stream 92 invokes application 94 to process procedure 96. Procedure 96 obtains information from DBMS 100 via SQL requests 98. As procedure 96 is processing, information is needed from DBMS which in turn needs information from DBMS 124 to complete its processing. With the present invention, this information may now be obtained, while remaining transparent to the user on the UNIX86".

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

5) White does not disclose errors or error response, at p. 12:9-10.

Examiner's response:

5) The examiner disagrees with applicant's characterization of the applied art. White does disclose errors and error response, at p. 17:40, "error and information messages related to the interaction".



**TUAN DAM**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**